



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,823	12/09/2003	Miguel A. Estrada	LOT920030075US1 (029)	4386
46371 7590 03/08/2009 CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP STEVEN M. GREENBERG 950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE SUITE 3020 BOCA RATON, FL 33487				
EXAMINER OUELLETTE, JONATHAN P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/08/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1480
Alexandria, VA 22313-1480
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/731,823
Filing Date: December 09, 2003
Appellant(s): ESTRADA ET AL.

Steven M. Greenberg
Reg. 44,725
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 10/6/2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 5/2/2008.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences, which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal, is contained in the brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Hatscher et al. (US 2004/0122693 A1)

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language

2. **Claims 1, 8, and 15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hatscher et al. (US 2004/0122693 A1).
3. As per **independent Claims 1, 8, and 15**, Hatscher discloses a method for managing membership in a collaborative computing environment community (Abstract), the method comprising: receiving identification of a selected group of end user persons to invite to join the collaborative computing community; evaluating the selected group to

identify one or more invitees there from (Fig. 7A-7H, Para 0033, Para 0050-0052, People Finder); inviting the one or more identified invitees (Fig. 7A-7H, Para 0053, invitation); and receiving an indication from one or more invitees that the invitee wishes to join the community (Claim 13 and 14).

(10) Response to Argument

1. The Appellant has made the argument that the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest receiving an indication from one or more invitees that the invitee wishes to join the community.
2. However, Hatscher does disclose notifying people about the community (Para 0053, Invitation) and requesting the potential members to subscribe if they want to receive community information (Fig. 7G); therefore, the subscription of new members would be an indication of user's wish to join a community.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the Examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.